

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JAMILAH SABREE,
Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. **06-C-78**

OXFORD MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC.,
Defendant.

ORDER

On November 17, 2006, the court held a hearing on plaintiff's motion to compel [Docket entry No.38]. Appearng on behalf of the plaintiff was attorney DeVonna Joy. Attorneys Carlos Ortiz and Thomas Schrimpf appeared on behalf of the defendant.

The court had briefly discussed the motion to compel with counsel on October 20, 2006. The court instructed the parties to attempt to resolve the matters in dispute and, if they were unable to come to an agreement, this court would decide. The parties were further instructed to submit their respective positions on the discovery requests prior to the hearing.

Based on all of the information provided prior to and at the hearing, and for reasons stated on the record, the court finds as follows:

Interrogatory 3/Request 24 - By November 30, 2006, the defendant is to confirm that the list of names previously furnished is complete or furnish any additional names. The defendant shall indicate who are current and who are former employees and furnish the last known address for the former employees.

Request 9 - Pursuant to prior court request, the defendant indicates that copies of the identified complaints were mailed to the plaintiff on November 11, 2006.

Request 19 - By **November 30, 2006**, the defendant is to provide the name and address of its long distance telephone provider.

Request 25 - The defendant has produced the file of its employee known as Michael Fox.

Interrogatories 8 and 9/Requests 3 and 4 - The defendant has now responded to these requests and recognizes its continuing duty to supplement with any additional information.

Request 14 - The defendant has furnished verification of debt.

Interrogatory 12/Request 20 - The defendant has now produced documentation as to net worth. The defendant recognizes its continuing duty to supplement with any additional information.

Interrogatory 5 - The defendant previously responded to this interrogatory. The plaintiff acknowledges that if more specific information is desired, further interrogatories can be propounded.

Request 16 - The defendant has produced documentation supporting the defendant's claims and defenses in the Rule 26(a) disclosure. The defendant recognizes its continuing duty to supplement with any additional information.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that since the foregoing resolves the plaintiff's motion to compel, it is now denied as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED,

1. The parties have requested to extend the discovery deadline for sixty(60) days. The court will **GRANT** the parties' request and extend the discovery deadline until **February 28, 2007**. The defendant's request to file summary judgment motions at this time is **DENIED**.
2. The court will conduct a telephone conference on **March 5, 2007 at 8:30 a.m.** to discuss further scheduling, including the filing of motions. The court will initiate the call. The telephone scheduling conference set for 2/1/2007 is **removed** from the court's calendar.
3. The court will **DENY** any further attorney fees and costs on the present motion to compel to either party.
4. The court will extend the time for plaintiff to submit its attorney fee petition on the motions to compel [Docket entries No. 30 and 38] until **November 30, 2006**. The defendant is to reply by **December 7, 2006**.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 21st day of November, 2006.

s/AARON E. GOODSTEIN
United States Magistrate Judge